

# An Anonymous Laudatory Poem in Honor of Basil I

ATHANASIOS MARKOPOULOS

This is an introduction to a laudatory poem composed in honor of Basil I, published below. This poem, studied by Gyula Moravcsik in the early 1960s,<sup>1</sup> is composed in accordance with models of Byzantine dodecasyllable verse forms.<sup>2</sup> The anonymous poet exalts Basil in several ways: he is compared to David (special and clear reference is made to Basil's humble origins [vv. 70–88]); the virtues and attributes of the new emperor are enumerated (vv. 93–106); the emperor's peaceful disposition is extolled (vv. 139–150); his desire to erect impressive buildings in Constantinople is praised (vv. 151–158), as is his mercifulness (vv. 157–167) and his fair judgment (vv. 177–179). The poem ends with good wishes for Basil's protection and for his victories against "the followers and friends of Mani" (vv. 204–231).<sup>3</sup>

The poem was composed by a learned contemporary of Basil and belongs to the epideictic category of Byzantine literature, of which there are several specimens in verse and prose specifically dedicated to members of the Macedonian dynasty. Whether a text is a narrative, such as the classical *Vita Basili*, or an encomium like that for Romanos II, recently edited by Odorico,<sup>4</sup> in general, writers

of laudatory works follow, with minor structural variations, the model clearly shaped by Menander. The hero appears almost like an apparition formed by his various virtues and distinctive, important characteristics.<sup>5</sup> The poem for Basil is not an exception, for as Moravcsik has observed,<sup>6</sup> it follows the same path. We must, however, stress that the focal point of Moravcsik's research was Basil's genealogy and the legends created around it. It was for this reason that he related the poem to other texts of this type written for Basil and the new dynasty: the Funeral Oration of Leo VI the Wise, the Life of Basil, and the *Chronographia* of Symeon Logothete.<sup>7</sup> Moravcsik showed clearly and persuasively the links between the poem for Basil and this type of literature. Moravcsik, however, did not produce a new edition of the poem nor did he place the poem within the general context of intellectual life in the ninth century. Instead, he limited himself to extracting and commenting only on evident references to Basil's origins.<sup>8</sup> I shall examine the poem as a whole, and single out specific problems that merit discussion.

## THE MANUSCRIPT AND ITS EDITION

To my knowledge the poem has survived in one codex only, the Laurentianus IX, 23. To date there is no description of the manuscript, and Angelo-Maria Bandini's work is our only source. Without specific reason Bandini assigns the codex to the

I am greatly indebted to George Galavaris, who kindly translated the Greek version of this article.

<sup>1</sup>See G. Moravcsik, "Ἀνώνυμον ἀφιερωτικὸν ποίημα περὶ τοῦ αὐτοκράτορος Βασίλειου Α΄," in *Εἰς μνήμην Κ. Ι. Ἀμάντου* (Athens, 1960), 1–10, *Studia Byzantina* (Amsterdam, 1967), 139–46, and "Sagen und Legenden über Kaiser Basileios I.," *DOP* 15 (1961), 61–126, *Studia Byzantina*, 147–220. The poem has been published by A. Brinkmann, *Alexandri Lycopolitani contra Manichaei opinionem disputatio* (Leipzig, 1905), xvi–xxii.

<sup>2</sup>There are five exceptions to the general rule of paroxytone accent in verses 78, 94, 118, 152, and 192.

<sup>3</sup>An extensive summary of its contents is given by Moravcsik, "Ἀνώνυμον ἀφιερωτικόν," 4, and "Sagen und Legenden," 63–64. For the verse referring to the Paulicians see below, pp. 227 and 229.

<sup>4</sup>See P. Odorico, "Il calamo d'argento. Un carme inedito in onore di Romano II," *JÖB* 37 (1987), 65–99; esp. pp. 69–71, on encomia to the emperors of the Macedonian dynasty, with bibliography.

<sup>5</sup>R. J. H. Jenkins, "The Classical Background of the *Scriptores post Theophanem*," *DOP* 8 (1954), 24–25, repr. in idem, *Studies on Byzantine History of the 9th and 10th Centuries* (London, 1970), IV.

<sup>6</sup>"Ἀνώνυμον ἀφιερωτικόν," 5–6, and "Sagen und Legenden," 65 ff.

<sup>7</sup>"Ἀνώνυμον ἀφιερωτικόν," 5–7, and "Sagen und Legenden," 66–67, 76 ff, 110–21.

<sup>8</sup>"Sagen und Legenden," 69–79, 81–86, 90–100, 104–8. N. Tobias, *Basil I (867–886), The Founder of the Macedonian Dynasty*, Ph.D. diss. (Rutgers University, 1969), 20–22, repeats the views of Moravcsik without any additional discussion; also H. Hunger, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner*, II (Munich, 1978), 113.

tenth century.<sup>9</sup> The manuscript consists of two sections, completely different in type of script and in content, which have been bound together with four blank leaves between, in order to form a new codex.<sup>10</sup> The second part of the codex is incomplete with a number of leaves missing from the beginning and the end of the text, most likely lost during binding.

The first part contains selections from the work of John Chrysostom, texts by Leo Choïrosphaktes, and the Life of Euphrosynos the Cook (*BHG* 628). Unquestionably this part does not date from the tenth century. In fact, it must have been written much later, at the end of the twelfth or the beginning of the thirteenth century. The second part of the manuscript opens with the poem for Basil, which covers three folios (fols. 168–169av).<sup>11</sup> It continues with Didymos' work Against the Manichaeans (fols. 170–178v); the treatise of Alexander of Lykopolis, also titled Against the Manichaeans (fols. 179–192v); and concludes with the work Περὶ αὐτεξουσίου by Methodios of Patara (fols. 193–197).<sup>12</sup> As a result of the incompleteness of this part of the codex, the first sixty verses of the poem for Basil are missing and the text of Methodios is incomplete. August Brinkmann, more reliably than Bandini, assigned the second part of the codex to the end of the ninth or the beginning of the tenth century,<sup>13</sup> and published an edition of the poem, the only one extant to date, in the introduction to his edition of the work of Alexander of Lykopolis.<sup>14</sup> The lacunae of the poem had already been noted by Bandini, who, in his catalogue, cited the incipit and desinit of the text and also a short extract (vv. 212–17 Δὸς νίκος αὐτῷ—Μάνεντος

μυσταγωγὸς καὶ φίλος).<sup>15</sup> It seems, however, that Brinkmann's edition attracted almost no attention from Byzantinists, as has been observed by Moravcsik.<sup>16</sup>

#### THE AUTHOR

Neither Brinkmann nor Moravcsik attempted to attribute the poem to any particular author of the ninth century. All the same, both authors related the poem to Photios. Brinkmann drew attention to the contents of the second part of the Laurentianus,<sup>17</sup> while Moravcsik compared several verses in the poem to certain poetical compositions of the patriarch.<sup>18</sup> In recent years the attribution of the poem to Photios has been generally considered, although no specific arguments have been advanced to justify the attribution.<sup>19</sup> Indeed, a careful examination of Photios' work shows a close relation to the poem. First of all, two known motifs in the poem, relating Basil to David (vv. 70–76 Δαυὶδ νέος μὲν—τῶν ἀνακτόρων and vv. 212–214 δὸς νίκος—δεσπότης),<sup>20</sup> in some aspects come very close to two of the hymns composed by the patriarch for Basil (PG 102, col. 581c Ἐξάρχου—Κυρίου and cols. 582b–84a Τὸ συμπαθὲς καὶ πρᾶον—συνευφραίνεσθαι).<sup>21</sup> These verses had already been related by Moravcsik to the tenth and especially to the eighteenth homily of Photios; in the latter the victorious Basil is seen as a new David not only on account of his triumphant victories in the battlefield, but mainly because of his humble origins.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>15</sup> Bandini, 430.

<sup>16</sup> Ἀνώνυμον ἀφιερωτικόν, 3–4. H. Grégoire was the exception ("Miscellanea epica et etymologica. IV. Autour des Pauliciens," *Byzantion* 11 [1936], 610–14) who, commenting briefly on the poem, promised to return to the problem of date, which, to my knowledge, he never did. Recently an attempt has been made to comment on the poem by P. A. Agapitos: Ἡ εἰκόνα τοῦ αὐτοκράτορα Βασιλείου Α' στῆ φιλομακεδονικῇ λογοτεχνίᾳ 867–959, *Ἑλληνικά* 40 (1989; pub. 1991), 285–322, esp. 289–97. I thank the author who kindly let me read his study in manuscript form.

<sup>17</sup> Brinkmann, xxv ff.

<sup>18</sup> Moravcsik, Ἀνώνυμον ἀφιερωτικόν, 5, 7–8, and "Sagen und Legenden," 64.

<sup>19</sup> L. Brubaker, "Politics, Patronage, and Art in Ninth-Century Byzantium: The *Homilies* of Gregory of Nazianzus in Paris (B.N.Gr. 510)," *DOP* 39 (1985), 1–13, esp. 6; A. Schminck, *Studien zu mittelbyzantinischen Rechtsbüchern*, Forschungen zur byzantinischen Rechtsgeschichte, 13 (Frankfurt, 1986), 92 note 232; P. Magdalino, "Observations on the Nea Ekklesia of Basil I," *JÖB* 37 (1987), 51–64, esp. 58 note 40.

<sup>20</sup> For the relation of David to Basil, see below, p. 227–28.

<sup>21</sup> PG 102, cols. 577–84. The third hymn of Photios for Basil (Ἀπὸ λογικῶν λειμῶνων—τὰς ζωηφόρους ἰθύνης: PG 102, cols. 583–84) is reprinted by Moravcsik, "Sagen und Legenden," 62–63.

<sup>22</sup> Photios, homily 18, Φωτίου Ὁμιλῖαι, Ἑλληνικά παράστ. 12, ed. B. Laourdas (Thessaloniki, 1959), 177, 10–16; 179, 10–

<sup>9</sup> A.-M. Bandini, *Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Mediceae Laurentianae*, vol. 1 (Florence, 1764), 427–30. Bandini's dating is accepted without any discussion by F. Halkin, "Les manuscrits grecs de la Bibliothèque Laurentienne à Florence. Inventaire hagiographique," *AnalBoll* 96 (1978), 22. I have studied the manuscript in a microfilm kindly provided by the Laurentian Library.

<sup>10</sup> Bandini, *Catalogus*, 430; cf. also Brinkmann, *Alexandri Lycopolitani . . . disputatio*, iv. The four blanks have not been taken into account in the numeration of the folios of the codex.

<sup>11</sup> Erroneously Brinkmann noted fols. 168–171v. For the second part of Laurentianus see L. Perria, "Una minuscola libraria del secolo IX," *RSBN* 26 (1989) [1990], 117–37 and esp. 118–25, which appeared after the completion of the present article.

<sup>12</sup> It is worth noting here that the numbering of the folios of the codex is incorrect because fol. 169a is omitted; so (without considering the blank leaves), the text of Didymos begins on folio 171 and not on fol. 170 as was noted on the upper right margin of the codex. The erroneous numbering of the folios was followed both by Bandini in his catalogue and by Brinkmann.

<sup>13</sup> Brinkmann, v.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. above, p. 225, note 1.

There are other verses, however, which find direct and clear parallels in Photios' three hymns for Basil. For example, comparisons can be made between verses 93 to 98 (Βασίλειος γὰρ—πανασφαλῆς φύλαξ) and verses 192 to 193 (ὁ δ' αὖ—στεφηνόφορος) of the poem and Photios' verses ἀπὸ λογικῶν λειμῶνων—ἰθύνης (PG 102, cols. 583c–84c). Moreover, according to the poem, Basil is κεκαλωπισμένος κλήσει πανόλβω (vv. 107–8), while according to Photios, he is καλλώπισμα εἰρήνης (PG 102, col. 584b); according to the poem and Photios' texts, Basil is εἰρηνοποιὸς (vv. 131, 222; PG 102, cols. 581A, 583A, 584B).<sup>23</sup> In the poem and in Photios' texts, the emperors who reigned before Basil are given the attribute ὀφρὺς θράσους (v. 190; PG 102, col. 581c); Basil φορεῖ τὸ στέφος (poem v. 207; PG 102, col. 584c), while Jesus is referred to as στεφοδότης (PG 102, col. 584c); finally God is asked to protect with his right hand the people from enemies of the empire (poem vv. 209–11; PG 102, cols. 580B, 582A).

In addition to the verses already specified by Moravcsik, there are other verses in the poem that find parallels mainly in the eighteenth homily of Photios, such as verses 139 to 146, which mention the happy state of affairs of the empire, and verses 121 to 124, referring to the defeats of the enemies of the empire.<sup>24</sup> Furthermore, the very delicately nuanced phrases χρῖσμα τῶν ἀνακτόρων and χρῖσμα τῆς ἐξουσίας (poem, vv. 76, 86) occur as χρῖσμα τῆς βασιλείας in a letter addressed by Photios to Basil;<sup>25</sup> the phrase ἀσώματα φύσεις (v. 150) can be traced in the *Amphilochia*,<sup>26</sup> while verse 219 of the poem καὶ τοὺς Μάνεντος μυσταγωγοὺς καὶ φίλους is almost a paraphrase of a passage in the *Contra Manichaeos* by Photios.<sup>27</sup> The play on words (vv. 77 f) deserves special attention. Basil is

characterized as λεία βάσις of the empire.<sup>28</sup> A comparable play on words is found in the *History of Petros Sikeliotes*, written shortly after 870,<sup>29</sup> a work with which Photios was familiar enough to use in his *Contra Manichaeos*.<sup>30</sup>

Apart from these various types of correlation between the poem and Photios' works, mostly pertaining to the use of words and phrases, there is additional strong evidence to support the attribution of the poem to the patriarch. For this, the poem must be considered in the context of Photios' activities in connection with the ideological and cultural renaissance that began in Constantinople when Basil I ascended the throne.<sup>31</sup> It is well known that in the *Life of Ignatios* and in the text of Pseudo-Symeon, Photios appears to be the author of the dynastic genealogy of the new emperor. According to this genealogy, the continuity of the Macedonian dynasty is symbolized in the word ΒΕΚΛΑΣ, "which comprises the first letters of the following names: Basil, Eudocia, Constantine, Leo, Alexander, and Stephanos."<sup>32</sup> In the poem there are several references to the dynasty, concentrating on the new "dynamism" brought by Basil, in contrast to the representatives of the Amorion dynasty (vv. 75–88, 95–98, 131–38, 157–62, 200–203 etc.). Photios displays the same enthusiasm in his first hymn for Basil: "Ὅταν σῆς δυναστείας τὰ ἔργα ἐννοήσω (PG 102, col. 579A) or Μεγαλύνω σου, Σῶτερ, τὴν θεῖαν δυναστείαν (ibid., col. 580A).

However, the comparison of Basil with David, and to a certain extent with Solomon, corresponds to the esthetic image prevalent in the last quarter of the ninth century. Certainly Basil was not the first Byzantine emperor to be compared to David. But in his case, this parallelism becomes the heart

17. Moravcsik, 'Ἀνώνυμον ἀφιερωτικόν, 5–9, and "Sagen und Legenden," 69–70.

<sup>23</sup> It should be noted that the adjective εἰρηνοποιὸς is used by Photios after 877. See A. Schminck, "Rota tu volubilis," in *Cupido Legum* (Frankfurt, 1985), 223 and note 87.

<sup>24</sup> Photios, homily 18, ed. Laourdas, 174, 24–28; 179, 17–21.

<sup>25</sup> *Photii patriarchae Constantinopolitani Epistulae et Amphilochia*, ed. B. Laourdas and L. G. Westerink, I (Leipzig, 1983), 98, 3–4. 106.

<sup>26</sup> *Amphilochia*, ibid., IV, ed. Westerink (1986), 13, 46; 16, 41; VI, ed. Westerink, fasc. 1 (1987), 264, 15. I draw attention to the frequent use by Photios of the adjective ἀκήρατος found in verse 154 of the poem; see ibid., index, vol. VI, fasc. 2, s.v.

<sup>27</sup> Ch. Astruc et al., "Les sources grecques pour l'histoire des Pauliciens d'Asie Mineure," *TM* 4 (1970), §§ 2–3 (121, 10–20). If we consider the Greek index in this edition, we conclude that Photios uses the word μυσταγωγία and its derivatives very often (ibid., 220 s.v.).

<sup>28</sup> Ibid., §91 (39, 29–31 and note 47). Grégoire ("Autour des Pauliciens," 611) was aware of this word play, which is also noted briefly by P. Lemerle, "L'histoire des Pauliciens d'Asie Mineure d'après les sources grecques," *TM* 5 (1973), 6.

<sup>29</sup> Lemerle, "L'histoire des Pauliciens," 28.

<sup>30</sup> Ibid., 47.

<sup>31</sup> See the recent observations by P. Magdalino, "The Bath of Leo the Wise and the 'Macedonian Renaissance' Revisited: Topography, Iconography, Ceremonial, Ideology," *DOP* 42 (1988), 97–118 and esp. 115; cf. also A. Schminck, "Frömmigkeit ziere das Werk," *Subseciva Groningana* 3 (1989), 83 ff.

<sup>32</sup> Pseudo-Symeon, Bonn ed., 689; cf. Vita Ignatii, PG 105, cols. 565–68. Concerning ΒΕΚΛΑΣ see Moravcsik, "Sagen und Legenden," 67–69; R. J. H. Jenkins, "The Chronological Accuracy of the 'Logothete' for the Years A.D. 867–913," *DOP* 19 (1965), 91–112, esp. 98–99 (= *Studies*, III). Both articles contain the earlier bibliography on the subject. To these should be added E. Kislinger, "Der junge Basileios I. und die Bulgaren," *JÖB* 30 (1981), 140 and note 16; idem, "Eudokia Ingerina, Basileios I. und Michael III.," *JÖB* 33 (1983), 134 and note 92.

of the dynasty's exaltation.<sup>33</sup> Various sources agree that the emperor took delight in these comparisons, and we may say that he even encouraged them. We should consider the statue of Solomon placed in the foundations of the Nea,<sup>34</sup> or the known inscription in the Καίνουργιον Palace.<sup>35</sup> An examination of Photios' work shows the role that he himself—not surprisingly—played in Basil's exaltations. This role was indeed very active and strong. Apart from the hymns for Basil in which references to psalms 71 and 151 persist, Hergenröther has convincingly shown that the letter addressed by Photios to Theophanes, deacon and protonotarios, which includes a number of questions of interpretation referring to David and Solomon, has in fact Basil as its recipient.<sup>36</sup> This unusual "collaboration" of Photios with Basil takes a secular character, built upon a religious foundation (Council of 879/880), and is manifested in the homilies of Gregory of Nazianzos in cod. Parisinus gr. 510. The illumination of this precious manuscript is the best example of Photios' policies both in the ecclesiastical and cultural areas, in which the presence of Basil is apparent, but discreet.<sup>37</sup> Subsequently the dynasty was to confirm the parallel-

ism between Basil and David first through the patriarch's pupil, Leo VI the Wise;<sup>38</sup> later, Constantine Porphyrogenitus would relate Michael III to Saul, so that the reader who has become aware of such comparisons would view favorably the members of the Macedonian dynasty in contrast to the representatives of the Amorian dynasty.<sup>39</sup>

In view of all this, we can claim that the attribution of the poem to Photios is based not only on a philological examination of vocabulary and phraseology, but also on a consideration of the ide-

<sup>33</sup> The first relevant observations were made by Moravcsik, 'Ἀνώνυμον ἀφιερωτικόν, 7–9, and "Sagen und Legenden," 69–70. A brief but significant mention is made by S. Der Nersessian, "The Illustration of the Homilies of Gregory of Nazianzus: Paris Gr. 510. A Study of the Connections between Text and Images," *DOP* 16 (1962), 195–228, esp. 222. The article by H. Buchthal, "The Exaltation of David," *JWarb* 37 (1974), 330–33 focuses mainly on the era of Porphyrogenitus. Among more recent studies the following should be singled out: Magdalino, "Observations on the Nea Ekklesia," (above, note 19), 55, 58 and notes 40–42; H. Maguire, "The Art of Comparing in Byzantium," *ArtB* 70 (1988), 88–103, esp. 88–93 referring to laudatory works in Byzantine literature. Cf. also Schminck, "Frömmigkeit ziere das Werk," 86–87.

<sup>34</sup> The relevant evidence is found in Magdalino, "Observations on the Nea Ekklesia," 58 and note 42.

<sup>35</sup> . . . εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι, λόγε τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὅτι ἐκ πτωχείας Δαυϊτικῆς ἀνύψωσας τὸν πατέρα ἡμῶν καὶ ἔχρισας αὐτὸν τῷ χρύσματι τοῦ ἁγίου σου πνεύματος . . . (Theophanes Continuatus, Bonn ed., 335). For a very careful analysis of the role played by the building activities of Basil in the Byzantine imperial ideology see P. Alexander, "The Strength of Empire and Capital as Seen through Byzantine Eyes," *Speculum* 37 (1962), 339–59, esp. 348–50, repr. in idem, *Religious and Political History and Thought in the Byzantine Empire* (London, 1978), III, with bibliographical additions, p. 357a; cf. Magdalino, "Observations on the Nea Ekklesia," passim.

<sup>36</sup> Photios, ep. 241, ed. Laourdas and Westerink; see J. Hergenröther, *Photius Patriarch von Konstantinopel*, II (Regensburg, 1867), 253–54; Magdalino, "Observations on the Nea Ekklesia," 58 note 41. Cf. E. Anagnostakis, Το επεισόδιο της Δανηλίδας, in Ἡ καθήμενη ζωή στὸ Βυζάντιο (Athens, 1989), 388–89.

<sup>37</sup> See I. Spatharakis, *Corpus of Dated Illuminated Greek Manuscripts* (Leiden, 1981), I, no. 4 and II, nos. 10–15, and the recent article by Brubaker, "Politics, Patronage, and Art in Ninth-Century Byzantium" (above, note 19) with the earlier bibliog-

raphy, in which the study by Der Nersessian (above, note 33) has a special place. To these should be added A. D. Kartsonis, *Anastasis: The Making of an Image* (Princeton, 1986), 140 ff and esp. note 53; I. Spatharakis, "A Note on the Imperial Portraits and the Date of Par. gr. 510," *JÖB* 39 (1989), 89–93 (he insists on proposing that Paris. 510 was offered to Basil after Germanicia). The approach of G. Galavaris to these problems is also significant: see Ἡ ζωγραφικὴ τῶν χειρογράφων στὸν δέκατον αἰῶνα, in *Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus and His Age* (Athens, 1989), 341–43. In its content note also the well-known Palazzo Venezia box, which Maguire ("The Art of Comparing in Byzantium" [above, note 33]) assigned to Basil's time, whereas A. Cutler and N. Oikonomides, "An Imperial Byzantine Casket and Its Fate at a Humanist's Hands," *ArtB* 70 (1988), 77–87, to the time of Leo the Wise. More recently I. Kalavrezou, "A New Type of Icon: Ivories and Steatites," in *Constantine VII*, 377–96, esp. 392 ff, has strengthened Maguire's dating. For the artistic interests of Photios during his first patriarchate see S. Dufrenne, "Une illustration 'historique' inconnue du Psautier du Mont-Athos, Pantocrator No. 61," *CahArch* 15 (1965), 83–95.

<sup>38</sup> For the praises of Basil by Leo in his own funeral oration see Moravcsik, 'Ἀνώνυμον ἀφιερωτικόν, 3, 5–8; cf. idem, "Sagen und Legenden," 64, 81, 83; Hunger, *Profane Literatur* (above, note 8), I, 71–3, 133–4; I. S. Čičurov, "Teorija i praktika vizantijskoj imperatorskoj propagandy (poučenijsa Basilija I i epitafija L'va VI)," *VizVrem* 50 (1989), 106–15.

<sup>39</sup> Jenkins' assertion that ". . . we should not blame Constantine for failing as a historian; we should rather admire him as an encomiast . . ." ("The Classical Background" [above note 5], 26) is apt for understanding the extent of Porphyrogenitus' involvement in the Vita Basilii. With reference to the subject of our discussion see the observations of Moravcsik, 'Ἀνώνυμον ἀφιερωτικόν, 5–6, 8–9, and "Sagen und Legenden," 65–67, 69, 77–78, 81–84, 88–9, etc.; cf. Kislinger, "Der junge Basileios I." (above, note 32), 137–40. For Porphyrogenitus' attitude toward Michael III shown in his texts, see the recent observations of Kislinger, "Eudokia Ingerina," (above, note 32) passim; idem, "Michael III.—Image und Realität," *Eos* 77 (1987), 389–400. P. Schreiner, "Das Herrscherbild in der byzantinischen Literatur des 9. bis 11. Jahrhunderts," *Saeculum* 35 (1984), 132–51; Ja. N. Ljubarskij, "Der Kaiser als Mime," *JÖB* 37 (1987), 39–50. See also Maguire, "The Art of Comparing in Byzantium" (above, note 33), 91–93 and Kalavrezou, "A New Type of Icon" (above, note 37), 394–95. Finally, the "Hortatory Chapters" of Basil I(?) may also be included in the encomiastic literature of the Macedonian dynasty but for reasons other than the ones presented here. See the contributions of A. Kazhdan, "The Aristocracy and the Imperial Ideal," in *The Byzantine Aristocracy, IX to XIII Centuries*, ed. M. Angold, BAR Int. Ser. 221 (1984), 43–57 and I. Čičurov, "Gesetz und Gerechtigkeit in den byzantinischen Fürstenspiegeln des 6.-9. Jahrhunderts," in *Cupido Legum* (above, note 23), 33–45, esp. 40 ff. Cf. also G. Prinzing, "Beobachtungen zu 'integrierten' Fürstenspiegeln der Byzantiner," *JÖB* 38 (1988), 14 ff, 30.

ological world of the period of Basil, which laid the foundations for the ideology of the Macedonian dynasty. In this world it is Photios who shapes the policies which are to be followed.

#### THE DATE

Already Brinkmann had considered the clear reference to the Paulicians (vv. 212–17) as a terminus ante quem for the composition of the poem. Since Chrysocheir was defeated between 871/72, the poem must have been written shortly before this date.<sup>40</sup> Brinkmann's view was accepted by Moravcsik<sup>41</sup> but is not followed by Schminck, who proposes a date ca. 877 and relates the poem to the second patriarchate of Photios.<sup>42</sup>

Brinkmann makes a reasonable case. Without a doubt, the defeat of the Paulicians in 872<sup>43</sup> was a great event, and it seems fair to assume that Photios refers to events of his time. However, Schminck's hypothesis cannot be dismissed, and those are strong arguments in favor of his dating: (1) If the poem was written ca. 877, nearly ten years would have elapsed since Basil's ascent to the throne. This span of time would have given the poet the opportunity to praise and exalt the emperor with certainty. By that time the emperor had displayed—and the poet had witnessed—all the qualities of a great emperor: justice, good works, good judgment, etc.<sup>44</sup> This appreciation is expressed in all three hymns composed by Photios for Basil. (2) The references in the poem to the Μάνεντος μυσταγωγούς καὶ φίλους (v. 217) is not as strong a criterion for dating as Brinkmann believed, because Photios' polemics against the Manichaeans continued after the fall of Tephrike (878).<sup>45</sup> For example, in the preface of the Εἰσαγωγή τοῦ νόμου dated around 885/86,<sup>46</sup> the patriarch refers again to the Manichaeans, to Mani and

his followers.<sup>47</sup> This reference is interpreted more convincingly if we accept the hypothesis that the poet knew of Chrysocheir's defeat and that he was expecting the expedition for the conquest of Tephrike, a fact that would explain his pleading for the army being prepared for the expedition. (3) The poem does not contain any traces of pleading, therefore, it cannot be considered the result of any attempt to expiate the emperor. On the contrary, the tone of the poem is calm and triumphant, which is true for the other hymns addressed by Photios to Basil. (4) The manner by which the dynasty is exalted shows that the dynasty had, by this time, established very strong foundations in the state.<sup>48</sup> (5) The poem defines a new period during which Basil's praises have acquired new dimensions. Suffice it to think of the Nea, the construction of which took four years and which was inaugurated by Photios in 880.<sup>49</sup> We may also consider the cod. Parisinus gr. 510 dated between 879–883.<sup>50</sup>

Before we close, something should be said about the circumstances under which the Laurentianus came into being. It is well known that shortly after 870 Photios wrote the known *Narratio contra Manichaeos*. In this the patriarch copied, in fact, but without mentioning it at all, the relevant text of Petros Sikeliotes.<sup>51</sup> Among the writers who, according to Photios, concerned themselves with the appearance of Mani, a special place is occupied by Alexander of Lykopolis, whose text is transmitted to us by the manuscript in Florence. In fact Photios' reference to Alexander is the only secure testimony we have concerning this Neoplatonic philosopher.<sup>52</sup> This fact and the inclusion of Didymos' work, which is also against the Manichaeans, in the Laurentianus, led Brinkmann to the following hypothesis: the Florentine manuscript was "as-

<sup>47</sup> Ibid., 4, 21–6, 23.

<sup>48</sup> Cf. A. P. Kazhdan, "Social'nyj sostav naselenija vizantijskich gorodov v IX–X vv.," *VizVrem* 8 (1956), 90.

<sup>49</sup> Magdalino, "Observations on the Nea Ekklesia," passim; cf. idem, "Basil I, Leo VI, and the Feast of the Prophet Elijah," *JÖB* 38 (1988), 193–96.

<sup>50</sup> Cf. above, p. 228 and note 37.

<sup>51</sup> Cf. above, p. 227 and note 30.

<sup>52</sup> Photios, *Contra Manichaeos* (above note 27), § 37(131, 23–26). It should be noted here that the edition of Alexander's work by Brinkmann is the only critical one to this day. In recent years there have been translations of this text into English (P. W. van der Horst and J. Mansfeld, *An Alexandrian Platonist against Dualism: Alexander of Lycopolis' Treatise "Critique of the Doctrines of Manichaeus"* [Leiden, 1974]), and into French (A. Villey, *Alexandre de Lycopolis, Contre la doctrine de Mani*, [Paris, 1985]) accompanied, esp. the English translation, by substantial introductions. Enlightening also is the critical review of the French translation by H.-M. Schenke, *JbAC* 30 (1987), 213–17.

<sup>40</sup> Brinkmann, xxiv–xxvii.

<sup>41</sup> Moravcsik, "Ἀνώνυμον ἀφιερωτικόν, 4–5, and "Sagen und Legenden," 64.

<sup>42</sup> Schminck, *Studien*, 92 and note 232. A. Schminck has communicated in a letter to me his views on the matter, with which I am in agreement and which I have attempted to supplement. I take the opportunity to thank Dr. Schminck for his kindness.

<sup>43</sup> For the dates see Lemerle, "L'histoire des Pauliciens," 96–103; cf. also M. McCormick, *Eternal Victory* (Cambridge-Paris, 1986), 152 ff.

<sup>44</sup> At this point, verses 218–19 in the poem (ἐκτεινον αὐτοῦ τοὺς χρόνους μηρεστάτως / ὑπὲρ προφήτου Μωσέως τὰς ἐκτάσεις) are, perhaps, decisive. See, also above, note 23 referring to the adjective εἰρηνοποιούς used by Photios.

<sup>45</sup> These dates are not absolutely certain; see the reservations of McCormick, *Eternal Victory*, 154 note 84.

<sup>46</sup> Schminck, *Studien*, 14–15.

sembled" by Photios himself during the period of his first exile with the sole purpose of expiating Basil.<sup>53</sup> Paul Lemerle thought that Brinkmann's hypothesis was "indémontrable et inutile," and wondered whether the second part of the codex with its contents against the Manichaeans was not the very imperial manuscript produced by Basil long before the fall of Tephrike.<sup>54</sup> Clearly, it is not easy to prove with any degree of certainty that the creator of the Laurentianus is Photios. At the same time, one cannot consider it a coincidence that Photios knew the text of Alexander of Lykopolis, contained in the Florentine manuscript, and that this manuscript contains also the poem for Basil and Didymos' text. On the contrary, I think, every-

thing points to the hypothesis that Photios had already collected, according to his old habit,<sup>55</sup> in the Laurentian codex a number of works that he needed for his own essays against the Manichaeans. When he ascended to the patriarchal throne for the second time (877), at a time when the dynastic ideology was already crystallized and the expedition for the conquest of Tephrike was about to be undertaken, Photios offered to Basil his own collection in which he added the laudatory poem.

University of Crete

<sup>53</sup> Brinkmann, xxv–xxxi.

<sup>54</sup> Lemerle, "L'histoire des Pauliciens," 6.

<sup>55</sup> For this approach of Photios see Brubaker, "Politics, Patronage, and Art in Ninth-Century Byzantium," 6, whose observations coincide to a certain extent with ours; see Νέα στοιχεία για τη χρονολόγηση της "Βιβλιοθήκης" του Φωτίου, Σύμμεικτα 7 (1987), 177–78.

## Appendix

### Laurent. IX, 23

fol. 168 ὑπεκπροχεύων παντὶ σώματος μέρει  
ἀπὸ κρατὸς καὶ μέχρι ταρσῶν εὐλόγως.  
καὶ μαρτυρεῖ δὲ τοῦτον ὁ Χριστὸς λέγων·  
"εὗρον τὸν ἄνδρα Βασιλεῖον τὸν μέγαν,  
65 ὃν εὐκλεῶς ἔχρισα τῷ θεῷ σθένει,  
ἐμοὶ ποθεῖνδον ὄντα πρὸς τῇ καρδίᾳ,  
ὡς ὄντα πιστὸν οἰκέτην μου καὶ φίλον,  
ἐμῶν θελητὴν πανσόφων ἐνταλμάτων  
καὶ τρισσοφεγγῶν εὐσεβῶν προσταγμάτων."  
70 Δαυὶδ νέος μὲν εἰς δόμους γεννητόρων,  
μικρὸς δὲ τάξει τῆς ἀδελφικῆς φύτλης,  
μέγας δὲ τῷ βλέποντι κρυπτὰ καρδίας·  
οὐκ εὐδοκεῖ γὰρ σωμάτων εὐρωστία  
ἀλλ' ἐν φαιναῖς πράξεσιν θεοῦ βίου·  
75 ἐκ ποιμνίων ἤρθη γὰρ εἰς ἀρχῆς κράτος  
καὶ χρίεται τὸ χρίσμα τῶν ἀνακτόρων.  
ὁ δεσπότης δὲ Βασιλεῖος, ἡ βάσις,  
ὁ παγκράτιστος τοῦ κράτους ἐπώνυμος,  
ἐγνωσμένος φῶς τῷ Θεῷ πρὸ τοῦ τόκου,  
80 ἄμωμος, ἄγνός, ἐστερημένος ψόγου,  
σκευὸς πεφυκὸς ἐκλογῆς σεβασμίας,  
ἐξ ἰδιωτῶν μετριοτάτου γένους  
ἀπραγμόνων τε καὶ σεμνῶν γεννητόρων  
πανευλαβῶν δὲ καὶ πανευσεβεστάτων,  
85 κόσμῳ τ' ἄγνωστος τῷ Θεῷ δ' ἐγνωσμένος,  
τὸ θεῖον ὄντως χρίσμα τῆς ἐξουσίας  
μέγαν τε θάκον τῶν ἀνάκτων τοῦ κράτους

εἴληφεν ὡς ὢν ἄξιος τῶν ἀξίων.  
δηλοὶ γὰρ ἡμῖν ἡ φερώνυμος φάσις,  
90 ἡ τῷ μεγίστῳ τῶν βροτῶν καθαρσίῳ-  
fol. 168v βάπτισμ' ὃ δὴ καλοῦμεν οἱ λελομένοι-  
ὑπ' ἀγγέλου δοθεῖσα τῷ κεκληκότε·  
Βασιλεῖος γὰρ βασιλεὺς πρῶτος μέγας  
εὐσυμπάθητος εὐπαρεκτικώτατος  
95 χρηστὸς γαλήνῃς εὐδιάλλακτος μέδων,  
σώφρων δίκαιος ἐγκρατὴς Χριστοῦ φίλος  
καὶ τῶν ἐκείνου πανσόφων προσταγμάτων  
ὅλος τελεστής καὶ πανασφαλῆς φύλαξ.  
εἰ γὰρ τις εἰς ἔννοιαν ἔλθοι τῶν πάλαι  
100 τῶν ἀνάκτων ἀξίαν λελογχότων  
καὶ τὰς ἐκείνων πρακτικὰς θεωρίας  
εἰπεῖν θελήσοι καὶ προδείξει τῷ λόγῳ,  
ἥτις φανοῦνται τοῦ κρατίστου δεσπότη.  
τοιοῦτος οὐ γὰρ ἔστι τῶν πάλαι μέδων  
105 αὐθις νέων τε τῶν φορούντων τὰ στέφη  
ἐν χρηστότητι καὶ θεουργικῷ βίῳ.  
ἔδει μενοῦνγε τὸν κεκαλλωπισμένον  
κλήσει πανόλβῳ τοῦ κράτους τῆς ἀξίας  
ἁμοῖρον εἶναι μὴδ' ὅλως τῶν πραγμάτων,  
110 ἐν πράγμασιν γὰρ ἔστιν ἡ τελειότης.  
λεῖα βάσις γὰρ εἰκότως παρεσχέθη  
βροτοῖς ἅπασιν ἐκ Θεοῦ τοῦ δεσπότη,  
ἐν ἧ βαδίῳ πᾶς τις ἀνθρώπων γένους  
ὑπεκδιδράσκει συμποδῶν προσκομμάτων

- 115 τῶν τῇ τραχείᾳ προσπεφυκότων τριβῶ,  
ἴκται δ' ἰθείᾳ καὶ πανωμάλῳ βάσει  
τῶν παντοδαπῶν ποικίλων χαρισμάτων,  
ὥν περ παρέσχεν ἡ χάρις τοῦ πνεύματος.  
120 τῷ χριστομιμήτῳ δὲ πανσέπτῳ λόγῳ  
ταπεινόφρων πέφηνεν ὡς εὐεργέτης,  
fol. 169 ἔθνων ὑποῦλων τοὺς ἀκαμπεῖς αὐχένας  
σοβῶν δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ καθαιρῶν εἰς τέλος,  
ἵππειον ἐχθροῦ Χριστοῦ ὥσπερ τὸ θράσος  
πῶλῳ πατάσσων εὐτελεστάτῳ γένει.  
125 τῇ πραότητι πλουσιώτατος πέλει  
πρόσταγμα πληρῶν ἐντολῶν θεηγόρων·  
ἐντεῦθεν αὐτῷ κληροδοτεῖ γῆς τοὺς ὄρους  
ἢ παντάνασσα τοῦ Θεοῦ θεσμουργία,  
τὸν μακαρισμὸν τῶν ἀνωτάτω γερῶν  
130 τοῦτῳ νέμουσα καὶ πορίζουσα κλέος.  
εἰρηνοποιὸς ἐστὶν ὡς ὁ δεσπότης  
Χριστός, τὸ σεπτὸν τῆς θεαρχίας σέλας,  
πόρρω διώκων τὰς θεοστυγεῖς μάχας  
ὡς κακοποιῶν προσφιλεῖς ἀλαζόνων,  
135 πᾶσιν δὲ πλοῦτον τῆς γαλήνης προσνέμων  
τῆς καλοπριοῦ καὶ πανημερωτάτης·  
υἱὸς δι' αὐτῆς χρηματίζων, ὡς θέμις,  
τοῦ παντάνακτος καὶ Θεοῦ καὶ δεσπότου.  
οἴκτου τὰ ρεῖθρα δαψιλῶς ἀναβρύει  
140 νέμων ἅπασιν πλουσίως ὑπηκόοις  
ὑπὲρ τὸ πλήθος ὑετοῦ σταλαγμάτων,  
ἀενάως βλύζει τε τὰς εὐποιίας  
ὀρμὴν ἔχων ἄπληστον εἰς εὐπραξίαν,  
μήπω κορεννὺς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ καρδίαν  
145 εἰς τὰς προχευσεις καὶ δόσεις τοῦ χρυσοῦ  
καὶ τὴν πενήτων ἄπλετον χορηγίαν.  
ὡς ἄλλο μηδὲν εἴπερ ἦν κεκτημένος  
σοφὸν Θεοῦ πρόσταγμα, τοῦτο καὶ μόνον  
ἱκανὸν ἦν πληῖσαι τε τοὺς ἐναντίους  
150 ξενίζον αὐτὰς τὰς ἀσωμάτους φύσεις  
fol. 169v καὶ προξενούν τὰ θεῖα τῶν ἀνακτόρων  
κάλλη θεαυγὴ τῶν βροτῶν ὑπέρτερα.  
εὐωχίαν τε τὴν διηνεκεστάτην  
ἀκηράτοις ἴκουσαν ἐν διεξόδοις  
155 κρείττω τε πάντων ὠραισμῶν ὀρωμένων  
καὶ τῶν ἀπάντων κοσμικῶν ἀνωτέραν.  
ποῖος τόπος γὰρ οὐ γέμει δωρημάτων  
τῶν τοῦ θεόπτου δεσπότης Βασιλείου;  
πραιτωρίων μὲν οἱ τόποι πεπλησμένοι  
160 πάλαι τε καὶ νῦν καὶ τὸ μέλλον εἰς τέλος  
ἐν ἡμέρᾳ καὶ νυκτὶ βλυζόντων σφόδρα  
ἄβυσσος ὄντων μηδαμῶς κενουμένη·  
καὶ πᾶς τις ἄλλος ἐνδουμένων τόπος  
πλήρης δέδεικται δεσπότης Βασιλείου  
165 τῆς εὐσεβουργοῦ παντελοῦς εὐποιίας·  
καὶ μέχρι πάντων ἐμβόλων τὴν πλουσίαν  
ὑπεκπροτείνει παμφανῶς εὐσπλαγχνίαν.  
πρὸς ταῦτα πάντως εἰκὸς ἐστὶν ἐκφράσαι  
τοὺς ἀγγέλους ἄνωθεν εὐλόγῳ λόγῳ  
170 σαφῶς τὸ ῥητὸν τοῦ πάλαι Κορνηλίου·  
“οἱ σοὶ μὲν οἰκτιρμοὶ τε καὶ μέγας τόνος  
τῶν σῶν προσευχῶν ἐν προσώπῳ κυρίου  
175 εἰς οὐρανὸν προσήλθον ἁπτέρῳ τάχει  
πρὸς σὴν ἄληστον μνημονευτικὴν χάριν  
εἰς τοὺς ἀπείρους καὶ διηνεκεῖς χρόνους  
αἰώνιον μισθὸν τε καὶ σωτηρίαν.”  
ποῖος βροτὸς πόνοις δὲ συμπεφυρμένος  
ἔχων τε θλίψιν ἐκ δυναστῶν τῆς βίας  
ἀρχοντικῇ τε καταδρομῇ δεδημένος  
180 καὶ τῷ τυράννῳ καὶ σπαρακτικῷ θράσει,  
fol. 169a εἴτα προσελθὼν τῷ γαλήνῳ δεσπότῃ,  
οὐκ εὐθὺς εὔρε τὴν λύσιν τῶν σφαλμάτων  
καὶ τὴν ἄμειψιν ἐνδίκως τῶν πρακτέων;  
τίς τῶν πάλαι γὰρ καὶ νέων ἀνακτόρων  
185 τοιοῦτον ἔσχεν εὐπρεπέστατον τύπον,  
ὡς πᾶσιν ἄρδην ἐξ Ἰσοῦ προστυγχάνειν  
νόοις, γέρουσιν, ἀστικοῖς τε καὶ ξένοις  
ἀρχοντα καὶ πένητα μὴ διακρίνων,  
καθὼς ἔφησεν ἡ Θεοῦ θεσμουργία;  
190 ἄναξι μὲν τοῖς πρόσθεν ὀφρὺς ἦν θράσους  
τοῖς προσπεσοῦσι μὴ νέμειν τὰς ἐκβάσεις·  
ὁ δ' αὖ ποθητὸς τῷ Θεῷ Βασιλεὺς  
ὁ πανσέβαστος, πάγκλυτος, στεφηφόρος,  
ἐπὶ ἀν προσέλθοι τις βροτῶν οἰκτρὸς πάνυ,  
195 παραβλέπει μὲν οὐδ' ὅλως τὸν πλησίον,  
κλίνας τὸ οὖς δὲ πᾶσι τοῖς λόγοις τότε  
δίδωσι τὴν αἴτησιν ἐν προθυμίᾳ.  
ἅπαντα ταῦτα Χριστὸς ὁ ζωῆς ἄναξ  
ἐν οὐρανοῖς ἔγραψεν εἰς θεῖον θρόνον·  
200 διδὼν κραταιοῖ τοῦ σεμνοῦ Βασιλείου  
τὸ βασιλεῖον ἐν Θεῷ κατὰ κράτος,  
οἶδεν γὰρ οἶδεν ὕψος εἰς φέρειν μέγα  
τοὺς τὴν ἔπαρσιν μὴδ' ὅλως κεκτημένους.  
ἀλλ' ὃ θεουργὲ τῶν ἀπάντων κτισμάτων  
205 ἄναξ ἀνάκτων Χριστὲ φῶς Θεοῦ λόγε,  
πατὴρ σὺν υἱῷ πνεῦμα τε ζωηφόρον  
τὸν γῆς ἄνακτα, τὸν φοροῦντα τὸν στέφος,  
Βασιλεῖον τὸν πιστὸν ὄντα σὸν λάτρην  
τῇ δεξιᾷ σου τῇ παναλκιμωτάτῃ  
210 φρούρει, φύλαττε καὶ βλάβης πάσης σκέπε  
fol. 169av ὀρωμένων ἐχθρῶν τε καὶ κεκρυμμένων.  
δὸς νίκος αὐτῷ τῶν ἐθνῶν κατὰ κράτους  
ὑπὲρ τὸ νίκος δαυιτικῶν μυριάδων,  
πρόσπονδα δεικνὺς τοῖς ποσὶν τοῦ δεσπότη  
215 ἅπαντα φύλα βαρβάρων κληρουχίας  
τούτων τροποῦσθαι τὰς φάλαγγας καὶ στίφη  
καὶ τοὺς Μάνεντος μυσταγωγούς καὶ φίλους.  
ἐκτεῖνον αὐτοῦ τοὺς χρόνους μηκεστάτως  
ὑπὲρ προφήτου Μωσέως τὰς ἐκτάσεις,  
220 διδοὺς ἄπλητον εὐετηρίαν βίου  
καὶ τῆς χαρᾶς πάντερπνον εὐρυχωρίαν,  
εἰρηνικῶς ἄγειν τε πάντα τὸν χρόνον  
μάχης ἄνευθε καὶ λύτης καὶ φροντιδῶν,  
ἄτερ δὲ δεινῆς ἐθνικῆς παρουσίας.  
225 σύστειλον ἐχθρῶν τοὺς φθόνους καὶ τοὺς δόλους  
καὶ τοὺς ἐκείνων δυσμενεστάτους λόχους.  
θαυμαστὸν αὐτὸν δεῖξον εἰς ἔθνη λόγε  
ἔχοντα τὴν σὴν ἀπρόσιτον ἐλπίδα  
λιταῖς ἀλήκτοις τῆς παννυμνίου κόρης  
230 τῆς παντανάσσης καὶ πανάγνου παρθένου  
καὶ τῶν ἀπάντων ἁγίων αἰωνίως.

61–62 Cf. Hom. *Il.* 21, 219; *Hymn. Ap.* 241 65 Cf. Aesch. *Choeph.* 849 69 Cf. Joan. Damasc. *Carm. Pent.* 102 (p. 216; PG 96, col. 837b) 70–75 Cf. Ps. 151: 1–7; Phot. *Hymn.*, PG 102, col. 581c; *Homil.* 18 (177, 10–16; 179, 10–17); *Epist.* 284, 2421–6 71 Cf. Pind. *Ol.*, 9, 55 74 4 Mac.7:7 76 Cf. 1 Regn. 9: 16; 10: 15; 15: 17; 2 Regn. 5: 17 al. 77 Petr. Sic. *Hist.* §91 (39, 29–31) 79 Cf. Hom. *Il.* 5, 214–5; 17, 377–78 al. 86 Cf. Phot. *Epist.* 98, 3–4. 106 93–98 Cf. Phot. *Hymn.* PG 102, cols. 583c–584c 95 Cf. Hom. *Il.* 2, 79; *Od.* 7, 136 al. 96–97 Cf. Ps. 71, 2–3 104 Cf. Hom. *Il.* 2, 79; *Od.* 7, 136; Joan. Damasc. *Carm. Pent.* 117 (p. 217; PG 96, col. 837c) 107–8 Cf. Phot. *Hymn.*, PG 102, col. 584b 111 Cf. supra v.77 Cf. Con. Const. (681) Act. 4 (H, 3, 1077c) 121 Ps. 128, 4 121–24 Cf. Phot. *Homil.* 18 (179, 17–22) 126 Cf. Cyr. Alex. *Ador.* 4 (1, 121b); Joan. Damasc. *De fide orth.* 4, 16 (PG 94, col. 1169a) 131 Cf. Ps. 71: 7; Phot. *Hymn.*, PG 102, col. 581a, 583a, 584b 132 Cf. Phot. *Amph.* 181, 11; 182, 3. 32 134–36 Cf. Rom. 1:30–32 139–146 Phot. *Homil.* 18 (174, 24–28)

150 Phot. *Amph.* 13, 76; 16, 41; 264, 15 155 Cf. Phot. *Amph.* 44, 10–14 171–76 Cf. Act. 10:30–31 177 Cf. Plat. *Phileb.* 51a; *Phaed.* 66b 188–89 Exod. 23:6; Prov. 31:9 190 Cf. Eur. *Fr.* 1040 Nauck<sup>2</sup> (= Stob. 3, 22, 5); Phot. *Hymn.*, PG 102, col. 581c 192–93 Cf. Phot. *Hymn.*, PG 102, cols. 583c–584c 198–203 Cf. Phot. *Homil.* 18 (177, 10–16); *Hymn.*, PG 102, col. 583a–b 205 Apoc. 19:13 207 Phot. *Hymn.*, PG 102, col. 584c 206 Cf. Maxim. Conf. *Hymn.* 2 (PG 91, col. 1422c) 209–10 Cf. Gen. 48:13, 14; Ps. 109:1; Matt. 26:64 al.; Phot. *Hymn.*, PG 102, cols. 580a, 582a 211–16 Cf. Ps. 71: 8–11; Phot. *Homil.* 10 (100, 4–8); *Hymn.*, PG 102, cols. 580b, 584a 217 Petr. Sic. *Hist.* §93 (41, 7–14) 218 Cf. Soph. *Aj.* 1402–3 222–24 Cf. Ps. 71:3; Phot. *Hymn.*, PG 102, cols. 581a, 583a, 584b

66 καρδία Brink: καρδάν cod. (-ν alia manu) 202 εἰς φέρειν Brink: εἰσφέρειν cod.